

Research Note 83-16

①

ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS STAFF OFFICER
(OESO) PERCEPTIONS OF THE ARMY'S
ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS
(OE) PROGRAM

Laurel W. Oliver

ADA 126294

LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT TECHNICAL AREA

DTIC
ELECTE
APR 4 1983
S B D



U. S. Army

Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

October 1981

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

DTIC FILE COPY

83 04 01 040

2004 0326 012

Best Available Copy

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER Research Note 83-16	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. AD-A126394	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Organizational Effectiveness Staff Officer (OESO) Perceptions of the Army's Organizational Effectiveness (OE) Program	5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED 1979-80	
7. AUTHOR(s) Laurel W. Oliver	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER	
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences 5001 Eisenhower Ave., Alexandria, VA 22333	8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)	
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Human Resources Development Directorate Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel Washington, D.C. 20310	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 2Q263731A792 Task A, Work Unit 002	
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)	12. REPORT DATE October 1981	
	13. NUMBER OF PAGES 66	
	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED	
	15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE	
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release, distribution unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Organizational Effectiveness, Organizational Development, Organizational Effectiveness Staff Officer (OESO), Army OE Program		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) A 219-item questionnaire was administered to 150 experienced OESOs to provide preliminary data on their perceptions of their role as OESOs, their OESO positions, OE users, the nature of OE operations, and the use of the four-step APIE (Assessment/Planning/Implementation/Evaluation) approach to organizational development. The following findings were reported: About 74% of all Army OE operations are viewed by OESOs as being successful, and there is a higher reliance on subjective "gut feeling" indicators of success		

DD FORM 1473

EDITION OF 1 NOV 85 IS OBSOLETE

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

Item 20 (Continued)

than on "hard data" measures. OESOs perceive lack of communication, need for planning, command transitions, and leadership/management concerns as the issues OE users most frequently wish to address. OE operations most frequently engaged in are action planning, survey feedback, and team building. OESOs seldom complete the four-step process and also report doing relatively little documentation and evaluation. The findings of this study will provide data for the ongoing analysis of the impact of the Army's OE program.

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A	

2
COPY
INSPECTED

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

Research Note 83-16

ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS STAFF OFFICER
(OESO) PERCEPTIONS OF THE ARMY'S
ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS
(OE) PROGRAM

Laurel W. Oliver

Submitted by:
T. Owen Jacobs, Chief
LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT TECHNICAL AREA

Approved by:
Joyce L. Shields, Acting Director
MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL
RESEARCH LABORATORY

U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22333

Office, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel
Department of the Army

October 1981

Army Project Number
2Q263731A792

Manpower and Personnel

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

FOREWORD

The Leadership and Management Technical Area of the Army Research Institute (ARI) is investigating the impact of the Organizational Effectiveness (OE) program of the Army. The following report describes research conducted by the Organizational Effectiveness Technology Development Unit.

The purpose of the present research effort was to provide preliminary data on the perceptions of experienced OESOs concerning the Army's OE program. This research was needed for planning the analysis of the impact of the OE program and, in addition, supplies input to OE managers and trainers for planning the future direction of the OE program.

This report was prepared under Army Project 2Q263731A792, Command Processes and Evaluation, FY 79 and 80 Work Program, and was conducted by US Army Research Institute personnel.

ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS STAFF OFFICER (OESO) PERCEPTIONS OF THE ARMY'S ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS (OE) PROGRAM

BRIEF

Requirement:

The primary objective of the Army's Organizational Effectiveness (OE) program is to provide assistance to commanders for improving mission performance and increasing combat readiness. Although preliminary research on the program has been conducted by both the Organizational Effectiveness Center and School (OEC&S) and the Army Research Institute (ARI), to date there has been little Army-wide information available on the types, levels, clientele, and outcomes of current OE operations. The purpose of this research was to clarify aspects of the OE program; this would focus further research which will attempt to assess the impact of the program. It was specifically designed to provide descriptions of five general aspects of the OE program as currently implemented by experienced, full-time Organizational Effectiveness Staff Officers (OESOs): the OESOs themselves, the OESO positions, the OE users, the nature of OE operations, and the use of the four-step APIE (Assessment/Planning/Implementation/Evaluation) approach to organizational development.

Procedure:

One hundred fifty full-time, experienced (more than six months in the field) OESOs who were trained prior to 1979 answered a 219-item questionnaire addressing various aspects of OESO training, work demands, and OE program activities. The questionnaire consisted of multiple choice items (analyzed in terms of frequency counts), quantitative items (reported as frequencies or average ratings for the five-point scale), and open-ended items analyzed by a "content analysis" procedure (selection of a group of response categories into which the write-in answers are sorted).

Findings:

Although the response rate to the questionnaire was low (42%), the demographic characteristics of the respondents indicate research results can be generalized to the total population of OESOs. These results indicate that certain conditions are associated with the success of OE operations. Acceptance of OE at the OESO's location, for example, is positively related to success of operations. OESOs judged 74% of their operations successful, 9% unsuccessful, and 17% as "not sure." Other positive conditions related to the degree of success of the OE program include the amount of OE experience, the number of other OESOs, and OESOs' satisfaction with the direction of the OE program. OESOs (who report spending 70% of their time in OE work) perceive

lack of communication, need to plan, command transitions, and leadership/management concerns as the issues OE users most frequently wish to address. The OE operations OESOs most frequently engage in are action planning, survey feedback, and team building.

OESOs report they document their work infrequently, with experienced OESOs doing even less documentation than their more recently trained colleagues. Very little evaluation is being accomplished, especially for operations judged as less successful. Evaluation indicators most frequently used by OESOs tend to be subjective in nature ("gut feeling" and client comments) with "hard data" indicators such as AWOL rates much less frequently used. Thus OESOs seldom document, evaluate, or complete the four-step OE process. In general, acceptance of OE is reasonably good where the OESO respondents are located. Most OESOs feel they interact well with senior officers, although the percentage of OESOs reporting interaction difficulties increases with the grade of the senior officer. OESOs who experience less difficulty in interacting with senior officers tend to be of higher grade, work with a greater number of other OESOs, and report a higher percentage of successful operations than do OESOs reporting more interaction difficulty.

Less experienced OESOs work in smaller offices, which would provide minimal (or no) support by OE-trained peers. Contrary to OESO perceptions that 48% of their Key managers have attended the Key Managers' course, only 30% of the Key Managers have actually attended the course. This finding suggests that many Key Managers may not fully understand the objectives and functions of the OE program.

Utilization of findings:

The results of this study describe the current picture of OESOs and their OE jobs and also identify positive and negative aspects of the OE program. These findings provide data needed for planning research on the impact of the Army's OE program. The impact research is a major study undertaken to assess the impact of the Army's OE program. In addition, the findings of the present research constitute input to Army OE managers for planning the future direction of the OE program. These results also provide guidance for trainers at the Organizational Effectiveness Center and School in devising more effective techniques and procedures for OE training programs.

ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS STAFF OFFICER (OESO) PERCEPTIONS OF THE ARMY'S ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS (OE) PROGRAM

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Background	1
Purpose of Research	1
PROCEDURE	2
Questionnaire	2
Respondents	2
Distribution of Questionnaires and Preparation of Data	2
Analysis	2
FINDINGS	4
Background Characteristics of OESOS	4
OE Positions	5
OE Users	9
OE Operations	12
Use of the Four-step Process	15
Relationships among Selected Measures	20
Difficulty in Interacting with Senior Officers	22
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	28
REFERENCES	31
APPENDICES	
A. OESO Questionnaire	32
B. Classification of "Issues"	54
TABLES	
Table 1. Organizational Level of OE Positions of OESO Respondents . .	6
2. Location of OE Positions of OESO Respondents	6
3. Percent of Time Spent on OE-Related Activities by OESOs . .	8
4. Organizational Level of OE Users	9
5. Number of Times Issues Occurred During Six-Month Period as Reported by OESOs	10
6. Difficulty of Interacting with Senior Officers as Reported by OESO Respondents	11

TABLES

Page

Table 7.	Average Number of Times OE Operation Conducted During Preceding Six Months	13
8.	Extent to Which Four-Step Process Used for Successful and Unsuccessful OE Operations	16
9.	Degree to Which OESOs Shared Documentation with Others . .	17
10.	Frequencies of Use and Effectiveness Ratings of OE Evaluation Indicators	19
11.	Intercorrelations of Selected Questionnaire Items	21
12.	Responses to Item 202 According to Grade	23
13.	Degree to Which Operations Judged Successful by OESOs Perceiving Less or More Interaction Difficulty	24
14.	Number of Operations Reported and Total Number of Strategies Used for Preceding Six Months Reported by Respondents to Item 202	25
15.	Average Number of Times Specific Strategies Used During Preceding Six Months as Reported by OESOs Perceiving Less Interaction Difficulty and OESOs Perceiving Interaction Difficulty	26

ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS STAFF OFFICER (OESO) PERCEPTIONS
OF THE ARMY'S ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS (OE) PROGRAM

Introduction

Background

The Army's Organizational Effectiveness (OE) program makes use of behavioral science technology to improve the effectiveness of Army organizations. In the civilian community, these management and behavioral science skills and techniques are known as Organization Development, or OD. In the Army, OE is the application of selected OD methods in a military environment. The objective of the OE program is to provide assistance to commanders for improving mission performance and increasing combat readiness. This assistance is provided by an Organizational Effectiveness Staff Officer (OESO) who has been trained in a 16-week course at the Organizational Effectiveness Center and School (OEC&S)¹ at Ft Ord, California.

Preliminary research on the OE program has been conducted by both OEC&S and the Army Research Institute (ARI). The OEC&S research has focused on the acceptance of OE and the resources for its implementation. Related research by ARI has been concerned with the assessment of command climate and the collection of case studies of OE operations. Implementation of OE throughout the Army made necessary the assessment of the impact of this large-scale program, especially with respect to cost/benefit aspects of the program.

Purpose of Research

To date, however, there has been little Army-wide information available on the types, levels, clientele, and outcomes of current OE operations. The objective of the present research was to collect data which would provide a focus for further research which will attempt to assess the impact of the OE program. More specifically, the intent of the research was to provide descriptions of five general aspects of the OE program as currently implemented by experienced, full-time OESOs:

- (1) the OESOs themselves,
- (2) the OESO positions,
- (3) the OE users,
- (4) the OE operations, and
- (5) the use of the four-step process.

¹OEC&S was formerly the Organizational Effectiveness Training Center (OETC)

The purpose of this report is to present descriptive data collected in this research. Further descriptive results broken out by the three largest major commands will be contained in a future report.

Procedure

Questionnaire

The questionnaire used in this research was developed jointly by ARI and Evaluation Directorate personnel at OEC&S. The items ARI produced were intended to obtain information on the OESOs, the OESO positions, the OE users, the OE operations, and the use of the four-step process. The emphasis of the items contributed by OEC&S, on the other hand, was on the training OESOs had received and the applicability of that training to their OE activities. Most of the questions were multiple choice items. Other items required estimates of percentages or number of times used, and a few items were open-ended write-in type queries. A copy of the questionnaire, "OESO Questionnaire 1979" is included as Appendix A.

Respondents

Of the 437 questionnaires which were distributed to OESOs trained prior to 1979, 185 (42%) forms were returned which were suitable for analysis. For this research, the intent was to investigate OE as practiced by full-time OESOs with some degree of experience. Consequently, data used in the analyses reported here came from OESOs who had been on their jobs for six months or more and who were working full-time in OE. This selection procedure resulted in a sample of 150 OESOs.

Distribution of Questionnaires and Preparation of Data

Questionnaires were mailed from OEC&S to all persons trained as OESOs before 1979. Questionnaires were completed during the late summer and early fall of 1979 and were returned by mail to OEC&S by the respondents. A copy of each questionnaire was made, and the forms were sent to ARI where the questionnaires were coded and the information keypunched. A duplicate copy of the resulting data deck was forwarded to OEC&S for use in their external evaluation.

Analysis

Multiple choice items. Most of the items on the questionnaire could be answered by checking one of the alternative responses such as "Yes" or "No." Results for these items are in terms of frequency counts (i.e., how many people checked each alternative) and percentages (the percent of respondents checking each alternative).

Quantitative items. For some items, the respondent wrote in a number (e.g., the number of times the transition model had been used in the preceding six months). Results for these items are reported as averages.²

Other items required the person to make a rating on a five-point scale, with each point on the scale having a numerical value (e.g., 5 = "Strongly Agree"). Results for the rating items are given as the number or percent of persons checking each category and/or the average rating on the five-point scale. To determine the strength of the relationship between some of the quantitative items, correlation coefficients were calculated.³

Open-ended items. Open-ended items allowed the respondent to write in an answer to the question asked or to give an "other" response when the set of responses for the item did not include the response the OESO wished to give. Open-ended items were analyzed using a "content analysis" procedure; this involves the selection of a group of response categories into which the write-in answers are sorted.

²Usually the arithmetic mean is used in reporting the results. Sometimes the most frequent response (mode) or the middlemost (median) response is reported.

³A correlation coefficient is a number (ranging from -1.0 to +1.0) which indicates the degree of relationship between two measures. If the number is positive (e.g., +.74), a person tends to have the same relative standing on both measures. That is, a person with a high score on one measure would have a high score on the other measure; a low scorer on one would tend to be a low scorer on the other; and so on. If the number is negative (e.g., -.63), the relationship is inverse--i.e., high scores on one measure tend to be associated with low scores on the other measure. A correlation of 0 indicates no relationship between the two measures: knowing a person's score on one measure gives no information about how the person scored on the other. The size of the number indicates how strong the relationship is. A correlation of .93 (or -.93) is a higher correlation than .54 (or -.54). Note that the strength of the relationship is shown by the size of the number, not whether it is positive or negative. A correlation of -.80 is just as high as a correlation of .80. For -.80, the relationship between the two measures is inverse or negative (high on one, low on the other).

Findings

Most of the findings presented in this section are grouped under the five aspects of the OE program upon which this research was focused: the OESOs, the OESO positions, the OE users, the OE operations, and the use of the four-step process. Results for each questionnaire item pertaining to a given area are presented, followed by a "synopsis" which summarizes the findings for that particular aspect of the OE program. Also included are results concerning relationships among selected measures and findings pertaining to difficulties in interacting with senior officers.

Note that the results presented here do not necessarily correspond exactly to the results presented in the OEC&S report, "Evaluation of the Organizational Effectiveness Course: External Evaluation Report" (undated, but distributed in November 1979). Differences are due to the fact that the OEC&S report is based upon the total 185 questionnaires, while these results are based upon the responses of the 150 full-time OESOs who reported six months or more of OE experience.

Background Characteristics of OESOs

In this section, OESOs are briefly described in terms of their background characteristics. These characteristics include: sex, population group, grade, class, career branch, MACOM, and months of OESO service.

Sex. Of the 150 respondents contained in the sample, seven were women, and 143 were men.

Population group. Over 96% of the respondents reported that their population group was "white." Persons checking one of the other categories totaled less than four percent of the sample (one black, one Hispanic, one Asian, and two American Indian/Alaska Native). Blacks were under-represented in the sample as they account for about seven percent of all OEC&S graduates. Other minorities, who constitute less than one percent of OE graduates, were over-represented.

Grade. Ninety-one percent of the respondents fell into the categories of lieutenant/captain (43 %) or major/lieutenant colonel (48%). The remaining respondents included one colonel, seven civilians, and six people who left the item blank or were NCOs.

Class. All of the respondents were trained in OETC classes prior to January 1979. Fifty-nine percent of the respondents were from 1978 classes, 26% from 1977 classes, and 15% from 1976 classes.

Career branch. Sixty-three percent of the respondents came from Infantry (36%, Field Artillery/Air Defense Artillery (12%), or Adjutant General/Finance (15%). The remaining respondents were distributed among other branches or were civilians.

MACOM. About two-thirds of the respondents were in three major commands, 31% in FORSCOM, 19% in USAREUR, and 18% in TRADOC. the remaining third of the sample was distributed among DARCOM (7%), USARPAC (3%), and other commands.

Months as OESO. Only four full-time OESOs reported less than six months service as an OESO. Of the remaining 150 full-time OESOs who constituted the sample for this research, the average (mean) period of time served was 16 months. The median amount of time was 14 months--i.e., half the respondents had served more than 14 months, and half of them had served less than 14 months as an OESO.

SYNOPSIS OF BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF OESOs: Almost all of the OESO respondents are white, male combat arms officers, ranging in grade from lieutenant through lieutenant colonel and trained at OETC during the years 1976-78. Most of them are located in the three largest MACOMs (FORSCOM, TRADOC, USAREUR), where they have served an average of 16 months. In general, the demographic characteristics of the respondents seem reasonably close to those of the total population of OESOs.

OE Positions

This section contains a description of the OESO's OE positions. The organizational levels of the positions as well as their specific locations are given. Also included in the description are the number of other OESOs in the OE office, whether the Key Managers had attended the Key Manager's course, and the extent to which the OESOs provided input to the Command Operating Budget Estimate (COBE). The time OESOs spent in OE-related activities and the types of OE activities they engage in are also reported.

Organizational level of OE position. Table 1 shows that more than a third (38%) of the respondents reported that their OESO position was at the installation/division level. Approximately another third was located at: the MACOM level (15%), at the separate brigade level (10%), or in the USAREUR community (8%). The remaining respondents were at other levels or left the item blank.

Location of OE position. The locations of the respondents' OE positions are given in Table 2. Of these positions, 44% fell into the personnel (G-1/DCPA/DCSPER) category. Another 14% of the responses were in the Chief of Staff category, and 10% of the respondents checked Commanding General (or ADC) for their location. The other respondents indicated their positions were in other locations such as HQDA, ROTC, and MACOM subsection.

Number of other OESOs. Over a third (39%) of the respondents reported working by themselves. Another 30% worked with only one other OESO while 11% of the respondents worked with two other OESOs and 8% worked with three others. About twelve percent of the respondents worked with four or more OESOs.

Table 1

Organizational Level of OE Positions of OESO Respondents

Organizational Level	Number and Percent ^a of Respondents
Separate Brigade	14 (10%)
Installation/Division	54 (38%)
USAEUR Community	12 (8%)
TRADOC School	8 (6%)
Corps	4 (3%)
MACOM	22 (15%)
Other	29 (20%)

^aPercentages based on 143 persons who responded to question.

Table 2

Location of OE Positions of OESO Respondents

Location	Number and Percent ^a of Respondents
G-1/DPCA/DCSPER	66 (48%)
CS	19 (14%)
CG or ADC	14 (10%)
DCSRM	1 (1%)
Other	39 (28%)

^aPercentages based on 139 persons who responded to question.

Attendance of Key Manager course by Key Managers. Attendance by the OESO's Key Manager of the Key Manager Course was reported by 48% of the sample, while 52% of the respondents said their managers had not attended the course.⁴

Input to COBE. Seventy-one percent of the OESOs asserted that they provided input to the local Command Operating Budget Estimate (COBE); 24% said they did not provide input; and 5% said they didn't know.

Time allocation. Most of these full-time OESOs reported that the bulk of their work was OE-related. The average (mean) amount of the time spent on OE-related activities was 70%. Thirty-one (21%) of the 147 people who answered the question reported that all of their work was OE-related, and over half the respondents (56%) said 80% or more of their work was OE-related. Table 3 shows the average percentage of time the respondents spent in various OE-related activities. The largest percentages of time were reported for assessment (22%) and implementation (19%). Scouting and contracting, evaluation, and professional development each accounted for 5% of the OESO's time.

SYNOPSIS OF OE POSITIONS: Many OE positions are reported to be at the installation or division levels and are likely to be in a personnel-type office. More experienced OESOs tend to work in the larger OE offices. It is believed that this situation is due to the fact that the larger OE offices are often found at a MACOM headquarters or at HQDA. It appears, then, that more experienced OESOs are assigned to the highest organizational levels. The results show that 39% of the OESOs work alone. Given the finding that more experienced OESOs work in the larger OE offices, less experienced OESOs find themselves in smaller offices where there is a minimum (or no) support by OE-trained peers. About half the OESO respondents believe their Key Managers have attended the Key Manager course, although only 30% of the Key Managers have actually done so. A substantial percentage (71%) of OESOs reported that they provided input to the COBE. Although more than half the OESOs said that 80% or more of their work was OE-related, the average (mean) amount reported was 70%. Assessment and implementation account for the largest percentage of the time spent on OE-related activities (22% and 19% respectively); scouting and contracting, evaluation, and professional development account for the smallest percentages (5% each).

⁴These percentages differ from those reported in the OEC&S External Evaluation Report, which states that 30% of the Key Managers had taken the course and 70% had not. The OEC&S findings were based on responses to questionnaires completed by the Key Managers themselves, while these results are based on the OESOs' perceptions. Apparently, a considerable number of OESOs believe their Key Managers have completed the Key Manager course when, in fact, they have not.

Table 3

Percent of Time Spent on OE-Related Activities by OESOs^a

Activity	Amount of Time
Assessment	22%
Implementation	19%
Building Client Relationships	12%
Planning	11%
Other Administrative Duties	9%
Teaching	7%
Scouting and Contracting	5%
Evaluation	5%
Professional Development	5%
Other	5%

^aSample consists of 150 full-time OESOs.

OE Users

The users of OE are described in this section. The level of the users, the issues they bring to the OESO, and the extent to which potential users are referred to other sources are reported. Two other factors, acceptance of OE and the difficulty of interacting with senior officers, are also briefly examined, although these factors are more extensively discussed in later sections.

Organizational level of OE users. As can be seen in Table 4, about one-third of the client system came from the company and battalion levels. Another 14% of the users were at the brigade, division, and Corps levels. Installation staff and MACOM staff accounted for 38% of the users. (The remaining 16% of users were tenant unit commanders in subordinate technical activities at USMA, etc.). Thus, approximately half the users were from the higher (brigade and above) levels called for in the 3-10 Year OE Plan (1979).

Table 4

Organizational Level of OE Users

Organizational Level	OE Users
Company	10%
Battalion	22%
Brigade	7%
Division	6%
Corps	1%
Installation Command Staff (below Directorate)	15%
Installation Staff	14%
MACOM Staff	9%
Other	16%

Issues. OESOs were asked which types of issues they had addressed during the preceding six months. The respondents were also asked to note the number of times each issue was assessed and dealt with as a principal client concern during the six-month period. The issues reported by the OESOs were classified according to the taxonomy shown in Table 5.⁵

⁵Appendix B contains a description of the process used to classify the issues. Table B-1 in Appendix B also contains expanded titles for the categories shown in Table 5 and enumerates typical issues for each category.

Table 5

**Total Number of Times Issues Occurred During
Six-Month Period as Reported by OESOs**

Issue	Frequency of Occurrence
Communication	529 (22%)
Planning	512 (22%)
Transitions	448 (19%)
Leadership/Management	387 (16%)
Morale	123 (5%)
Conflict	78 (3%)
Reorganization	64 (3%)
Assessment	64 (3%)
Specific Issues	58 (2%)
Training	36 (2%)
Miscellaneous	60 (3%)

As can be seen in Table 5, there are 10 major categories and a miscellaneous category into which issues were classified. The number of times the issue was reported for the six-month period was summed over all respondents, and these totals are also shown in the table. An inspection of Table 5 reveals that issues most frequently reported concerned communication (529 mentions), planning (512 mentions), transitions (448 mentions), and leadership/management (448 mentions).⁶ As noted in Appendix B, the categories are overlapping. One OESO wrote, "All of the work I've done in the last six months has dealt with improving management practices."

⁶These results differ somewhat from those found in the OEC&S External Evaluation Report (1979) for two reasons. First, the OEC&S report gives the number and percent of OESOs who reported the issues, while Table 5 shows the number of times the issue had been addressed during the preceding six months. Also, the two analyses classified the issues differently. The OEC&S report used 34 categories, and this analysis collapsed the issues into 11 categories.

Referrals. Of the 144 OESOs who answered how often they referred clients to other sources, 61 (42%) checked "Sometimes," 57 (40%) checked "Almost Never" or "Seldom," and 26 (18%) checked "Usually" or "Always." No information is available on what issues the referrals concerned or to whom the referrals were made.

Acceptance of OE. There were 148 OESOs who answered the question concerning the acceptance of OE at their locations. Of these respondents, two-thirds (68%) said acceptance was "good" or "excellent." Another 11% said it was "poor" or "terrible," and the remaining 21% described acceptance as "only fair." The relationship of OE acceptance to other factors will be reported in a later section.

Interactions with senior officers. Three items on the questionnaire concerned the difficulty of OESOs' interacting with senior officers. As can be seen in Table 6, only a small proportion of OESOs agreed that interactions with senior officers were difficult. However, the proportion of OESOs reporting difficult interactions increased with increases in the grade of the senior officer. For example, three percent of the respondents agreed that interactions with lieutenant colonels were difficult; six percent felt interactions with colonels were difficult, and 14% reported difficulty in interacting with general officers. The difficulty of interacting with senior officers proved to be related to other factors, and these relationships will be explicated in a later section.

Table 6

Difficulty of Interacting with Senior Officers
as Reported by OESO Respondents

Senior Officer Level	N	Number of OESOs Reporting Interaction is Difficult				
		Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
Lieutenant Colonel	148	97 (65%)	43 (29%)	3 (2%)	3 (2%)	2 (1%)
Colonel	148	76 (51%)	54 (36%)	10 (7%)	7 (5%)	1 (1%)
General Officer	147	56 (37%)	50 (33%)	20 (13%)	18 (12%)	3 (2%)

SYNOPSIS OF OE USERS: About a third of OE users are at the battalion and installation levels. The issues OESOs report users most frequently wish to address are lack of communication, need for planning, transitions of command, and leadership/management concerns. OESOs sometimes refer clients to other sources of assistance. However, no information was obtained on what issues the referrals concern or to whom the referrals are made. Generally speaking, acceptance of OE is reasonably good where the OESO respondents are located, and most OESOs feel they interact well with senior officers.

OE Operations

The OE operations engaged in by the OESO respondents are described in this section. Included here are the number of operations, the types of operations, and the success of the operations as reported by the OESOs for the preceding six-month period.

Number of OE operations. The average number of OE operations conducted by the OESOs in the preceding six months was about 10. The modal (most frequent) number reported was 10, and the median (point at which 50% fell above and 50% fell below) was 9.6.⁷ Note that the respondents were not asked how frequently other OESOs participated in the operations. Thus, the total number of operations (approximately 1800) for the entire group is smaller since OESOs working together would report the same operations. The extent of the overlap, however, is unknown. Also, no information was collected concerning the extent of the operations. An operation could range from a one-hour consultation with an OE user to a three-day workshop for a division staff requiring extensive planning and long-term follow-up.

Types of OE operations. The implementation strategies and their frequency of use by OESOs are given in Table 7. The table shows the average number of times the operation was conducted (1) for the entire group of respondents and (2) for the group of OESOs who actually used the technique. The four most frequently reported operations for the entire group were action planning, survey feedback, team building, and communications. It is commonly assumed that the transition model is the most frequently used operation. These results show that, for the entire group of OESOs, transitions tie with problem solving for fifth place in a group of 17 operations. For those OESOs actually using the operation, transitions

⁷The mean (arithmetic average) number of operations conducted was 12. The mean is higher than the mode or median because a relatively small number of people reported a great many operations (40 or more) for the six-month period. As a result, a small number of respondents have an undue impact on the mean. In this case, the author feels that the mean is not as accurate and that the mode and median more adequately describe the average number of operations.

Table 7

**Average Number of Times OE Operation
Conducted During Preceding Six Months**

OE Operation	Average Number of Times Operation Conducted	
	For Entire Group	For Persons Using Operation
Action Planning	4.5	5.4
Survey Feedback	4.0	5.8
Team Building	3.6	5.0
Communication	3.3	4.8
Problem Solving	3.1	4.3
Transition Model	3.1	4.0
Open Feedback	2.7	5.3
Goal Clarification	2.5	3.8
Role Clarification	2.3	3.5
Intergroup Cooperation	1.7	3.3
Conflict Resolution	1.6	2.7
Leadership and Management Development Course (LMDC)	1.6	3.8
Management of Meetings	1.6	2.8
Performance Counseling Training	1.3	2.7
Time Management	1.1	3.3
Management by Objectives (MOB) Training	.7	2.6
Job Design/Enrichment	.4	1.9

were in seventh place. In general, the rank order of use of the various operations was much the same whether the reported frequencies were averaged over the entire group of respondents or over the group of OESOs who had actually used the operation.

Table 7 reveals that many of the operations conducted by OESOs focus on interpersonal facilitation such as communication training and team building. Also frequently used are planning techniques or procedures--e.g., action planning and problem solving. Some operations which have low rates for the entire group of respondents are frequently used by those who do use them. Although MBO was never used by 71% of the OESOs, three people had used it 10 times and one person reported using it eight times. Job design/enrichment was never used by 79% of the respondents, but one person reported using it 10 times in the preceding six months.

It appears that some types of operations are strongly favored by certain OESOs. That interpersonal-type operations are frequently used is not surprising since this kind of training predominates at OEC&S. Practitioners, especially inexperienced ones, tend to use techniques with which they are familiar. The choice of an OE operation may be related to characteristics of the particular environment in which the OESO is working and/or to the fact that the OESO feels especially confident with that operation. A tendency which has been noted in the civilian community (Huse, 1975) is for OE consultants to "push" those interventions which are their particular specialties regardless of the needs of the organization. Especially in the early months of OE work, it is understandable that inexperienced OESOs would want to implement operations with which they are most familiar. As OESOs gain confidence in their abilities and develop a reputation for competence in OE, they are able to take more risks and try a greater variety of approaches. On the other hand, because of the mission of the units involved or their organizational level, certain operations may be more appropriate than others and tend to be frequently used in that particular environment.

Success of OE operations. There were 145 OESOs who evaluated the success of their operations. These respondents judged 74% of their operations successful and nine percent unsuccessful. They were not sure of the success of the remaining 17% of the operations. Note that "success" was not defined and its interpretation was therefore very subjective.

SYNOPSIS OF OE OPERATIONS: OESOs conduct, on the average, about 10 operations every six months. The four most frequently used operations for the entire group are action planning, survey feedback, team building, and communications. For the OESOs actually using the operation, the most frequently used operations are survey feedback, action planning, and open feedback. OESOs consider approximately three-fourths of their operations successful.

Use of the Four-Step Process.

OEC&S training focuses on the four-step process of Assessment/Planning/Implementation/Evaluation (APIE). Thus, it is of interest to investigate the extent to which this sequence is followed in day-to-day OE operations. The findings which are presented below attempt to explicate the use of the four-step process with respect to successful and less successful operations. Also discussed are the degree to which OESOs document their operations and the extent to which they share their documentation with others. The last part of the section concerns the evaluation indicators OESOs reported using--which indicators they use, how often they use those indicators, and how effective they consider the indicators to be.

Use of four-step process in successful and unsuccessful operations. OESOs were asked to indicate to what extent they had completed the four-step process for successful and unsuccessful operations. There were 143 ratings of successful operations and 101 ratings of unsuccessful operations. Table 8 shows the number and percentage of persons giving each of the five responses (ranging from "Almost Never" to "Almost Always") as well as the average rating of each step on the five-point scale. Note that the average ratings decrease from step to step in the process and that the ratings are lower for unsuccessful than for successful operations. From the results in Table 8, two conclusions can be drawn: (1) The evaluation step is accomplished by only a minority of OESOs, and (2) Use of the four-step process is considerably more extensive for the successful operations.

For unsuccessful operations, whatever goes wrong seems to occur at an early stage, frequently during the assessment step. One cannot tell from the data presented here whether the assessment step tends to be mishandled in unsuccessful cases or whether conditions for a successful operation simply cannot be achieved (for whatever reasons), resulting in a termination of the operation when this fact becomes apparent to the OESO and/or the OE user.

Documentation. As the OE program views evaluation as part of the documentation procedure, it is of interest to determine the extent to which operations are documented. The number of times OESOs reported documenting their operations during the preceding six months ranged from 0 to 25, with an average (mean) of 3.9⁸. A total of 541 documentations was reported by the 101 OESOs who had documented one or more operations. The total number of operations reported by OESOs was 1246, indicating that the number of operations documented during the six-month period was about 43%. This amount of documentation was accomplished by approximately two-thirds of the respondents since 31% of them did not document any of their operations. Lack of documentation may stem from a lack of understanding of the significance of documentation for the OE process and outcomes.

⁸In this case, the mean number of documentations is somewhat misleading since 46 (31%) of the OESOs reported no documentations. Thus, the modal (most frequent) response was "0," and the median (point at which 50% of the responses fell above and 50% fell below) was 2.3.

Table 8

**Extent to Which Four-Step Process Used for Successful
and Unsuccessful OE Operations**

OE Step	Number (Percent) Giving Responses					Average Rating
	Almost Never (1)	Seldom (2)	Sometimes (3)	Usually (4)	Almost Always (5)	
Successful Operations						
Assessment	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (4%)	9 (6%)	129 (90%)	4.9
Planning	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	9 (6%)	34 (24%)	99 (69%)	4.6
Implementation	2 (1%)	6 (4%)	28 (20%)	50 (35%)	57 (40%)	4.1
Evaluation	15 (11%)	39 (28%)	44 (31%)	27 (19%)	15 (11%)	2.9
Unsuccessful Operations						
Assessment	2 (2%)	5 (5%)	9 (9%)	12 (12%)	75 (63%)	4.5
Planning	13 (13%)	7 (7%)	32 (32%)	18 (18%)	31 (31%)	3.5
Implementation	29 (29%)	30 (30%)	25 (25%)	9 (9%)	8 (8%)	2.4
Evaluation	64 (64%)	14 (14%)	17 (17%)	4 (4%)	2 (2%)	1.7

One OESO justified lack of documentation in the following comment: "To answer all the questions you asked on time and percent of time during the last six months would require a large amount of time on documentation. I don't think this is necessary to justify my job. Satisfied customers will do the most to further OE in the Army."

Table 9

Degree to which OESOs
Shared Documentation with Others

Persons With Whom Documentation Shared	Number (Percent) Giving Responses					Rating
	Almost Never (1)	Seldom (2)	Sometimes (3)	Usually (4)	Always (5)	
OE Users (Commanders)	14 (12%)	8 (7%)	6 (5%)	20 (18%)	66 (60%)	4.0
Key Managers	41 (38%)	23 (22%)	20 (19%)	7 (6%)	16 (15%)	2.4
Other OESOs	17 (15%)	16 (14%)	29 (26%)	25 (23%)	24 (22%)	3.2
MACOM	72 (72%)	7 (7%)	8 (8%)	6 (6%)	7 (7%)	1.7

The degree to which documentation was shared with others is presented in Table 9. The number and percent of OESOs giving a certain response is shown under the response category, and the average rating (on a scale of one to five) is also given. As can be seen in the table, 78% of OESOs who reported documenting their operations almost always or usually shared documentation with OE users, with an average rating of 4.0 on the five-point scale. Somewhat less than half (44%) of these respondents almost always or usually shared documentation with other OESOs, with an average rating of 3.2. The picture is different, however, for Key Managers and MACOMs. Of OESOs who reported documenting, 23% almost always or usually shared documentation with Key Managers (average rating of 2.4), and only 13% almost always or usually shared documentation with MACOMs (average rating 1.7). In the absence of documentation requirements, these results are not surprising. It would be logical for OESOs to share documentation with users, especially if (although indications are that this is not generally the case) evaluation is planned from the beginning. It would also seem natural for OESOs to exchange ideas and to share the successes and failures of their work with their OE peers.

Evaluation indicators. Table 10 shows the number of OESOs using each indicator, the average number of times the users employed the indicator, and the average rating of effectiveness for the indicator on a five-point scale ranging from "1" (Terrible) to "5" (Excellent). (The effectiveness ratings were not limited to those OESOs who had actually used the indicator, but are averages for everyone who chose to respond to the item.) Evaluation indicators used by 60% or more of the respondents were: "gut feeling," interviews, client comments, and self-designed questionnaires. Indicators used by at least 20% of the OESOs included reduction of complaints, appearance of area, GOQ, AWOL rate, civilian personnel turnover, equipment maintenance, major inspections, reenlistment rate, and training time. Generally speaking, the more frequently used indicators were considered more effective. The six most effective indicators (with average ratings of 3.7 or greater on the five-point scale) were: "gut feeling," interviews, client comments, self-designed questionnaires, equipment maintenance and nonjudicial punishment rates. Note that the two most frequently used indicators ("gut feeling" and client comments) are the most subjective indicators. The next two most frequently used indicators (interviews and self-designed questionnaires) are subjective in the sense that the OESO determines the questions asked, but provide data which are more likely to be collected in a systematic fashion. Records data tend to be less frequently used. However, it should be pointed out that some of the data available from records would not be applicable for some situations. Civilian personnel turnover, for example, is probably not an appropriate indicator for many Army OE operations. Hence, rates of use may be somewhat misleading. Note that only one OESO reported using materials reduction as an indicator, yet that OESO used it 30 times! The respondents were also asked what indicators not on the questionnaire list they had used. Among those mentioned were: reliefs from command, civilian sick leave, MP blotter reports, EO complaints, backlog reduction, vehicle availability, and annual field inspection.

SYNOPSIS: USE OF THE FOUR-STEP PROCESS. The data collected on the degree to which OESOs use the four-step APIE process (Assessment/Planning/Implementation/Evaluation) show that earlier steps in the four-step process are more likely to be accomplished than later steps for both successful and less successful operations. And more steps are completed for successful than for unsuccessful operations. Yet even for successful operations, the evaluation step is generally not accomplished. Some 43% of the operations reported were documented. Yet a sizable proportion (31%) of the respondents report documenting no operations. When documentation is accomplished, it is most likely to be shared with the OE user, somewhat less frequently with other OESOs, and much less frequently with Key Managers and MACOMS. The most frequently used indicators (mentioned by 60% or more of the respondents) are subjective in nature ("gut feeling" and client comments) or involve feedback from interviews or self-designed questionnaires. "Hard data" indicators such as AWOL rates, civilian personnel turnover, and major inspections are much less frequently used. In general, the most frequently used indicators tend to be considered the most effective. Equipment maintenance and nonjudicial punishment rates are also considered among the most effective indicators. Not all indicators are appropriate in all locations, and some OESOs make heavy use of certain indicators.

Table 10

Frequencies of Use and Effectiveness
Ratings of OE Evaluation Indicators

Indicator	Number of OESOs Using Indicator	Average Number of Times Used	Average Rating of Effectiveness
<u>General</u>			
User Comments	136	9.4	4.0
"Gut Feeling"	123	13.2	3.8
Interviews	122	7.5	4.2
Reduction of Complaints	52	3.8	3.4
Appearance of Area	33	2.5	2.7
<u>Questionnaires</u>			
Self-Designed	91	4.5	4.1
GOQ	63	3.5	3.5
WEQ (Work Environment Questionnaire)	3	1.3	3.4
<u>Records Data</u>			
Reenlistment Rate	39	2.7	3.7
Civilian Personnel			
Turnover	37	2.6	3.3
Equipment Maintenance	37	3.8	3.8
Major Inspections	35	3.4	3.5
Training Time	34	4.2	3.5
AWOL Rate	30	2.4	3.6
Nonjudicial Punishment			
Rates	26	4.0	3.3
IG Complaints	24	3.8	3.3
Awards and Decorations	23	2.3	3.1
Time Reduction (for Task)	21	2.0	3.6
Unit Readiness Reports	21	3.1	2.8
Administration of Pay and Promotions	19	2.2	3.3
Courts Martial	18	3.7	2.9
Sick Call Rate	17	1.7	3.1
ARTEP Scores	16	2.6	3.5
Accident Rate	15	2.0	2.9
Barracks Larceny Rate	9	6.9	3.2
Materials Reduction	1	30.0	2.8

Relationships Among Selected Measures

Correlation coefficients (see footnote 3, page 3) were calculated for each pair of 12 selected questionnaire items. The questionnaire items selected were those considered to be of particular interest in assessing the interrelationships of factors important to the functioning of the OE program. These factors were: degree of success, OE experience, workload, senior officer interactions, and facilitating conditions. The item(s) associated with each factor are shown below.

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Item(s)</u>
Degree of success	No. 7 - percentage of successes reported
OE experience	No. 1 - months as OESO No. 2 - recency of training (OETC class)
Workload	No. 3 - number of clients No. 5 - number of operations No. 6 - number of documentations
Senior officer interactions	No. 8 - 05 interactions difficult No. 9 - 06 interactions difficult No. 10 - general officer interactions difficult
Facilitating conditions	No. 14 - number of other OESOs No. 11 - acceptance of OE No. 12 - satisfaction with direction of OE program

Table 11 contains the statistically significant correlations obtained in this analysis. In general, positive conditions tended to be related to each other. For example, the table shows that a higher degree of success is associated with greater experience and facilitating conditions. OE experience was also correlated with the number of other OESOs--that is, the more experienced OESOs tended to work in larger groups of OESOs than did the less experienced OESOs. This finding raises the question of whether less experienced OESOs are receiving the support they need in their initial OE assignments.

The items representing various aspects of the OESO's workload--the number of clients, of operations, and of documentations--were all intercorrelated to a substantial degree. None of the workload items, however, was significantly associated with any of the other items except that the number of documentations reported was negatively correlated with the number of months as an OESO. That is, the longer the officer had been an OESO, the less likely he or she was to document his or her OE operations. It is not known whether this result is related to a difference in training or to some other factor.

Table 11

Intercorrelations of Selected Questionnaire Items^a

Item	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
(1) No. months OESO (Item 3)	--	-.79		.30		-.14	.20		-.17	-.19		
(2) Class (Item 4)		--		-.26			-.17					
(3) No. clients (Item 5)			--		.74	.38						
(4) No. other OESOs (Item 6)				--			.18		-.14	-.19		
(5) No. operations (Item 39)					--	.43						
(6) No. documentations (Item 40)						--						
(7) Percent successes (Item 46)							--		-.17	-.25	.23	
(8) 05 interactions difficult (Item 200)								--	.48	.40	-.23	
(9) 06 interactions difficult (Item 201)									--	.67	-.27	-.13
(10) General officer interactions difficult (Item 202)										--	-.25	
(11) Acceptance of OE (Item 206)											--	
(12) Satisfaction with OE direction (Item 215)												--

^aOnly correlations significant at the .05 level or beyond are shown.

The three items related to interactions with senior officers (05s, 06s, and general officers) were substantially correlated with each other. The items representing difficulties in interacting with 06s and general officers tended to be negatively associated with positive conditions such as successes, experience, and facilitating conditions.

SYNOPSIS OF RELATIONSHIPS AMONG SELECTED MEASURES: Positive conditions such as degree of success, amount of OE experience, and facilitating conditions (number of other OESOs, acceptance of OE, and OESO's satisfaction with direction of OE program) are positively associated with each other. More experienced OESOs tend to work in the larger OE offices, a situation which may deprive less experienced OESOs of needed role models and support. More experienced OESOs also do less documenting than their less experienced colleagues. Difficulties in interacting with senior officers are significantly related to lesser acceptance of OE, less OE experience, and to a lesser degree of success.

Difficulty in Interacting with Senior Officers

In the preceding section, it was apparent that difficulties in interacting with senior officers were related to negative conditions and outcomes. It seemed of interest, then, to explore any differences between officers reporting less interaction difficulty and those reporting more. Accordingly, supplementary analyses were conducted to compare OESOs who answered "Strongly Disagree" or "Disagree" and those who answered "Neither Agree nor Disagree," "Agree," or "Strongly Agree" to Items 200-202. These items stated: "Interaction with [05s/06s/general officers] is difficult for me." The first group of respondents (those disagreeing) is the "less interaction difficulty" group. The remaining respondents (those who were neutral or agreed) constitute the "more interaction difficulty" group. Since the pattern of results is the same for all three items, the responses are reported here only for Item 202, which asked about the difficulty in interacting with general officers.

Grade. First, the relationship of grade to responses on Item 202 was examined. The group of respondents was dichotomized on grade into approximately equal groups (03 and below and 04 and above), and the results are given in Table 12. As can be seen in the table, there is a tendency for officers in the higher grades to perceive less difficulty in interacting with general officers.⁹ This result is not a startling one, given the hierarchical structure of the Army. If anything, it is surprising that the effect is not more pronounced.

⁹The inverse correlation between grade and interaction difficulty (-.18) is statistically significant ($p < .02$).

Table 12

Responses to Item 202 According to Grade

Response to Item ^a	Grade ^b		Totals
	03 and below	04 and above	
Strongly Disagree	16	34	50
Disagree	24	22	46
Neither Agree nor Disagree	9	9	18
Agree	10	6	16
Strongly Agree	2	1	3
Totals	61	72	133

^aItem reads, "Interacting with general officers is difficult for me."

^bCivilians and "other" respondents were not included.

Tenure, number of other OESOs, OE acceptance. The relationship between tenure (the number of months the respondent had been a full-time OESO) and interaction difficulty was not statistically significant. Apparently, most OESOs with six or more months of experience behind them feel comfortable in interacting with senior officers. Although not strong, there was a statistically significant relationship between interaction difficulty and the number of other OESOs working with the respondent.¹⁰ No statistically significant relationship occurred between interaction difficulty and the extent of the acceptance of OE. Of these three factors (tenure, number of other OESOs, and OE acceptance), only the number of other OESOs was related to interaction difficulty. It is possible that the support of other OESOs is more important than either experience or a favorable climate in interacting successfully with senior officers.

¹⁰The correlation between number of other OESOs and interaction difficulty was $-.16$. Although not large, this correlation was significant at the .03 level of probability.

Successes, number of operations, types of operations. Another cluster of factors which is of interest in comparing the groups perceiving less or more interaction difficulty includes the reported proportion of successes, number of operations, and types of operations. Responses concerning the OESOs' perceptions of success are summarized below in Table 13.

Table 13

Degree to which Operations Are Judged Successful by OESOs
Perceiving Less or More Interaction Difficulty

Group	N	Operations Judged as		
		Successful	Unsuccessful	Not Sure
Less interaction difficulty ^a	100	77%	8%	15%
More interaction difficulty ^b	40	68%	10%	21%

^aOESOs responding "Strongly Disagree" or "Disagree" to Item 202 ("Interacting with general officers is difficult for me.")

^bOESOs responding "Neither Agree nor Disagree," "Agree," or "Strongly Agree" to Item 202.

As shown in the table, the more interaction difficulty group reported fewer successful and more unsuccessful operations and were uncertain about more operations than was the group perceiving less interaction difficulty.¹¹

Although the average number of operations conducted by the two groups was almost identical, respondents who perceived less interaction difficulty reported using specific strategies more often than did respondents who perceived greater difficulty. The time period indicated for these items was the same--"within the last six months." Item 39 requested an estimate of the total number of operations conducted within that period, and Items 73-89 asked for estimates of the number of times various strategies (e.g., action planning, team building) had been used during the same period. Table 14 summarizes the results of the responses to Item 39 and Items 73-89.

¹¹There was a statistically significant difference ($p < .03$) between the two groups on percentage of "successful" operations reported, but the differences between the groups on percentage of "unsuccessful" and "not sure" operations were not statistically significant.

Table 14

Number of Operations Reported and Total Number of Strategies Used for
Preceding Six Months Reported by Respondents to Item 202

Group	<u>N</u>	Average Number of Operations Reported	Total Number of Strategies Used ^a	Average Number of Strategies/ Operations
Less interaction difficulty ^b	101	9.53	43.09	4.52
More interaction difficulty ^c	41	9.56	29.87	3.12

^aSummed over the specific strategies enumerated in items 73-89.

^bOESOs responding "Strongly Disagree" or "Disagree to Item 202 ("Interacting with general officers is difficult for me.")

^cOESOs responding "Neither Agree nor Disagree," "Agree," or "Strongly Agree" to Item 202.

It is clear from the table that the estimated number of operations was the same for both groups of OESO, but the less interaction difficulty group used more strategies per operation (4.52) than did the more interaction difficulty group (3.12). Table 15 breaks out the specific strategies reported by the two groups.

Table 15

Average Number of Times Specific Strategies Used during Preceding Six Months
as Reported by OESOs Perceiving Less Interaction Difficulty and OESOs
Perceiving More Interaction Difficulty

Strategy	Average Number of Times Strategy Used during Preceding Six Months	
	Respondents Perceiving Less Interaction Difficulty	Respondents Perceiving More Interaction Difficulty
Action Planning	4.99	3.39
Communication	3.23	3.56
Conflict Resolution	1.83	1.27
Goal Clarification	2.85	1.59
Job Design/Enrichment	.40	.22
Intergroup Cooperation	1.69	1.90
LMDC	1.84	1.22
MBO	.81	.37
Meeting Management	1.76	1.39
Open Feedback	2.98	2.05
Performance Counseling	1.32	1.22
Problem Solving	3.71	1.68
Role Clarification	2.63	1.61
Survey Feedback	4.13	3.41
Team Building	4.06	2.32
Time Management	1.35	.50
Transitions	3.50	2.17

Inspection of this table reveals that the group perceiving less interaction difficulty reported using 15 of the 17 OE strategies more frequently than did the more interaction difficulty group.¹² The less interaction difficulty group uses more strategies per operation and tends to use certain strategies more frequently. The more frequently used strategies included problem solving, transitions, action planning, goal clarification, and team building.

¹²Two of these differences were statistically significant: problem solving ($p = .01$) and transitions ($p = .03$). The use of several other strategies approached significance: action planning ($p = .07$), goal clarification ($p = .10$), and team building ($p = .10$).

SYNOPSIS OF DIFFICULTY IN INTERACTING WITH SENIOR OFFICERS: OESOs who experience less difficulty in interacting with senior officers tend to be of higher grade, work with a greater number of other OESOs, and report a higher percentage of successful operations than do OESOs reporting more interaction difficulty. These OESOs also use more strategies per operation and use certain strategies (such as problem solving and transitions) significantly more often than do their counterparts who experience more interaction difficulty.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Background:

The Army's Organizational Effectiveness (OE) Program involves the use of behavioral science technology to improve the effectiveness of Army organizations. In the civilian community, these management and behavioral science skills and techniques are known as Organization Development, or OD. In the Army, OE is the application of selected OD methods in a military environment. The objective of the OE program is to provide assistance to commanders for improving mission performance and increasing combat readiness. This assistance to the commander is generally provided by an Organizational Effectiveness Staff Officer (OESO) who has been trained in a 16-week course at the Organizational Effectiveness Center and School (OEC&S) at Ft. Ord, California.

The Army Research Institute (ARI) is helping to assess the impact of the OE program. The research described concerns a preliminary survey conducted in order to provide a current picture of OESOs and their jobs.

Approach:

Questionnaires were distributed to 437 officers who had received their OE training prior to January 1979. The sample of OESOs upon which the findings contained in this report are based consisted of 150 full-time OESOs who had been in OE work for six months or more.

Findings:

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF OESOs: Almost all of the OESO respondents are white, male, combat arms officers, ranging in grade from lieutenant through lieutenant colonel and trained during the years 1976-78. Most of them are assigned to the three largest MACOMs (FORSCOM, TRADOC, and USAREUR), where they have served an average of 16 months. In general, the demographic characteristics of the respondents seem reasonably close to those of the total population of OESOs.

OE POSITIONS: Most OE positions are at the installation or division levels and are likely to be in a personnel type office. More experienced OESOs tend to work in the larger OE offices. It is believed that this situation is due to the fact that the larger OE offices are often at a MACOM headquarters or at HQDA. It appears, then, that more experienced OESOs are assigned to the highest organizational levels. The results show that 39% of the OESOs work alone. Given the finding that more experienced OESOs work in the larger OE offices, less experienced OESOs find themselves in smaller offices where there is a minimum (or no) support by OE-trained peers. About half the OESO respondents believe their Key Managers have attended the Key

Manager course, but only 30% of the Key Managers have actually attended the course. A substantial percentage (71%) of OESOs report that they provide input to the COBE. Although more than half the OESOs said that 80% or more of their work was OE-related, the average (mean) amount reported was 70%. Assessment accounts for the largest percentage of the time spent on OE-related activities; scouting and contracting, evaluation, and professional development account for the smallest percentages.

OE USERS: About a third of OE users are at the battalion and installation levels. According to OESOs, the issues which users most frequently wish to address are lack of communication, need for planning, transitions of command. OESOs sometimes refer clients to other sources of assistance. However, no information was obtained on what issues the referrals concern or to whom the referrals are made. Generally speaking, acceptance of OE is reasonably good where the OESO respondents are located. Most OESOs feel they interact well with senior officers, although the percent of OESOs reporting interaction difficulties increases as the grade of the OE user increases.

OE OPERATIONS: OESOs conduct, on the average, 10 operations per six-month period. The four most frequently used operations for the entire group are action planning, survey feedback, team building, and communications. Contrary to expectations, the transition model ties for fifth place with problem solving for average times used by the entire group of OESOs. For the OESOs actually using the operation, the most frequently used operations are survey feedback, action planning, and open feedback. OESOs consider 74% of their operations successful and nine percent unsuccessful. They are uncertain about the remaining 17% of the operations.

USE OF THE FOUR-STEP PROCESS: The data collected on the degree to which OESOs use the four-step APIE process (Assessment/Planning/Implementation/Evaluation) show that earlier steps in the four-step process are more likely to be accomplished than later steps for both successful and less successful operations. And more steps are completed for successful than for unsuccessful operations. Yet even for successful operations, the evaluation step is generally not accomplished. Some 43% of the operations reported were documented. Yet a sizable proportion (31%) of the respondents report documenting no operations. When documentation is accomplished, it is most likely to be shared with the OE user, somewhat less frequently with other OESOs, and much less frequently with Key Managers and MACOMs. The most frequently used indicators (mentioned by 60% or more of the respondents) are subjective in nature ("gut feeling" and client comments) or involve feedback from interviews or self-designed questionnaires. "Hard data" indicators such as AWOL rates, civilian personnel turnover, and major inspections are much less frequently used. In general, the most frequently used indicators tend to be considered the most effective. Equipment maintenance and nonjudicial punishment rates are also considered among the most effective indicators. Not all indicators are appropriate in all locations, and some OESOs make heavy use of certain indicators.

RELATIONSHIPS AMONG SELECTED MEASURES: Positive conditions such as degree of success, amount of OE experience, and facilitating conditions (number of other OESOs, acceptance of OE, and OESOs' satisfaction with direction of OE program) are positively associated with each other. More experienced OESOs tend to work in the larger OE offices, a situation which may deprive less experienced OESOs of needed role models and support. More experienced OESOs also do less documenting than their less experienced colleagues. Difficulties in interacting with senior officers are significantly related to lesser acceptance of OE, less OE experience, and to a lesser degree of success.

DIFFICULTY IN INTERACTING WITH SENIOR OFFICERS: OESOs who experience less difficulty in interacting with senior officers tend to be of higher grade, work with a greater number of other OESOs, and report a higher percentage of successful operations than do OESOs reporting more interaction difficulty. These OESOs also use more strategies per operation and use certain strategies (such as problem solving and transitions) significantly more often than do their counterparts who experience more interaction difficulty.

Conclusions:

1. As less experienced OESOs tend to work in small offices, they may lack the support and role models available in larger offices.
2. Only 30% of the Key Managers have attended the Key Manager course. Unless the Key Manager has been an OESO (which is usually not the case), he or she may not fully understand the objectives and functions of the OE program. The fact that OESOs often do not know whether their Managers have attended the Key Manager course suggests the need for increasing communication between OESOs and their Key Managers.
3. The average amount of time spent on OE-related work is 70%, which suggests that some OESOs are not fully utilizing their OE training.
4. About a third (32%) of present OE users are at the company and battalion levels. The 3-10 Year Plan for OE projects a shift of OE operations to higher organizational levels (e.g., installation level).
5. OESOs perceive lack of communication, need to plan, and command transitions as the issues OE users most frequently wish to address. The OE operations OESOs most frequently engage in are action planning, survey feedback, and team building. These operations would seem to be appropriate for the issues reported by the OESOs.
6. OESOs report doing relatively little documentation, with experienced OESOs doing even less documentation than their more recently trained colleagues.
7. OESOs seldom complete the four-step process. Very little evaluation is being accomplished, especially for operations judged as less successful.
8. Most OESOs feel they interact well with senior officers, although the percentage of OESOs reporting interaction difficulties increases with the grade of the senior officer.

REFERENCES

Huse, E. F. Organization development and change, St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Co., 1975.

Organizational Effectiveness Center and School (OEC&S) report. Evaluation of the Organizational Effectiveness course. External evaluation report (Undated, distributed November 1979).

Organizational Effectiveness Division. Organizational Effectiveness 3-10 year plan (FY 80-86). Washington, DC: US Army, Office of Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, 6 November 1979.

APPENDIX A

Questionnaire administered to OESOs.
Questionnaire contains items upon
which the findings of this report
are based.

OESO QUESTIONNAIRE

1979

US ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE
BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

AND

ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS CENTER AND SCHOOL

PT 5297

DATA REQUIRED BY THE PRIVACY ACT

TITLE OF FORM: OESO Questionnaire 1979

PRESCRIBING DIRECTIVE: AR 600-46

AUTHORITY: Section 3012, Title 10, USC.

PRINCIPAL AND ROUTINE USES: The collected data will be used to support the research, evaluation, survey revision, normative data base, training requirements or other mission requirements of the USAOECS and ARI. The data may also be used to provide MACOM commanders with information about the opinions and attitudes of OE personnel with respect to management functions, activities and processes. No information will be provided to a commander which will allow any single individual or small group of individuals to be specifically identified. The data may be retained on computer cards, computer files, or individual survey forms to be processed for statistical analysis. COMPLIANCE IS VOLUNTARY. There is no effect upon the individual for failure to disclose information.

OESO QUESTIONNAIRE- 1979

INSTRUCTIONS

The purpose of this survey is to give us a "snapshot" of what the Army is doing in OE. You have information about the state of OE in the US Army that no one else can provide. Therefore, we request that you provide careful answers to all of the questions. We have tried to make this questionnaire quick and easy to complete. When elaboration of a particular response is needed or would be helpful, please feel free to add additional sheets as appropriate.

Note that all questions should be responded to within the time frame of the last six months (or that portion of the last six months that you've been assigned to your current OESO position). If you have previously been an OESO but are now in another type of job, please respond in terms of your last six months as an OESO.

BACKGROUND DATA

1. What is your MACOM? ☐ (1) FORSCOM ☐ (4) USAREUR
☐ (2) TRADOC ☐ (5) USARPAC
☐ (3) DARCOM ☐ (6) OTHER (please specify): _____
2. Are you a full-time OESO?
☐ (1) Yes ☐ (2) No
3. How long have you been assigned as an OESO? (To the nearest month)
 _____ months
4. What class were you in? ☐ (01) P-76 ☐ (07) 3-77
☐ (02) 1-76 ☐ (08) 1-78
☐ (03) 2-76 ☐ (09) 2-78
☐ (04) 3-76 ☐ (10) 3-78
☐ (05) 1-77 ☐ (11) 4-78
☐ (06) 2-77 ☐ (12) 5-78
5. How many OE clients have you had in the last six months? _____
6. Within your command, how many OESOs do you have working with you? _____
7. Where is your OESO position located within the organizational structure?
☐ (1) Separate Brigade
☐ (2) Installation/Division
☐ (3) USAREUR Community
☐ (4) TRADOC School
☐ (5) Corps
☐ (6) MACOM
☐ (7) Other (please specify): _____

(1/8)

(1/9)

(1/10,11)

(1/12,13)

(1/14,15)

(1/16,17)

(1/18)

USE
ONLY

8. Where is your position located?

- ☐ (1) G-1/DPCA/DCSPER ☐ (4) DCSRM
☐ (2) CS ☐ (5) Comptroller
☐ (3) CG or ADC ☐ (6) Other (please specify):

(1/19)

9. What is the position title of your rater?

(1/20)

10. Has your OE Key Manager attended the OE Key Manager's Course?

- ☐ (1) Yes ☐ (2) No

11. Do you provide input to the local Command Operating Budget Estimate (COBE)?

(1/21)

- ☐ (1) Yes ☐ (2) No ☐ (3) Don't know

12. Grade: ☐ (1) W1-W4

☐ (4) O6 and above

(1/22)

☐ (2) O1-O3

☐ (5) Civilian

☐ (3) O4-O5

13. Sex: ☐ (1) Male

☐ (2) Female

(1/23)

14. Population Group:

(1/24)

☐ (1) White

☐ (4) Asian/Pacific Islander

☐ (2) Black, Not Hispanic

☐ (5) American Indian/Alaska Native

☐ (3) Hispanic

15. Branch: ☐ (1) Infantry

☐ (06) QM, TC, Ordnance, Chemical

(1/25,26)

☐ (02) FA, ADA

☐ (07) AG, Finance

☐ (03) Armor

☐ (08) NP, NI

☐ (04) CE

☐ (09) Medical Corps, MSC, Chaplain

☐ (05) SC

☐ (10) Civilian

ALLOCATION OF TIME

USE
ONLY

Considering your workload during the past six months (or that portion of the six months that you've been assigned to your current position), please estimate the percent of time you have spent on:

16. Work in troop units: ____%

(1/27,28)

17. OE mission-related activities: ____%

(1/29,30)

Now, of the time spent directly on OE-related activities, please estimate the percent of time you have spent on the activities listed below. (Estimate to the nearest 5%; do not mention less than 5%.)

18. ____% Building Client Relationships (e.g., education of, or informal contacts with, potential clients)

(1/31,32)

19. ____% Scouting and Contracting

(1/33,34)

20. ____% Assessment

(1/35,36)

21. ____% Planning

(1/37,38)

22. ____% Implementation (include LMDC and OE-related skills training)

(1/39,40)

23. ____% Evaluation

(1/41,42)

24. ____% Teaching (formal instruction)

(1/43,44)

25. ____% Professional Development

(1/45,46)

26. ____% Other Administrative Duties

(1/47,48)

Other (please specify):

27. ____% _____

If you had your preference, where would you spend more time?

(Rank order first three preferences) 1 = 1st preference; 2 = 2nd preference; 3 = 3rd preference

(1/50) 28. ____ Building Client Relationships

34. ____ Teaching

(1/55)

(1/50) 29. ____ Scouting and Contracting

35. ____ Professional Development

(1/56)

(1/51) 30. ____ Assessment

36. ____ Other Administrative Duties

(1/57)

(1/52) 31. ____ Planning

37. ____ Mission Duties not related to OE

(1/58)

(1/53) 32. ____ Implementation

38. ____ Other (please specify):

(1/54) 33. ____ Evaluation

DOCUMENTATION

39. In the last six months, how many OE operations have you conducted? _____ (1/59,60)

40. In the last six months, how many times have you prepared case studies or other documentation of your OE operations that you can retrieve for review? _____ (1/61,62)

If you have documentation, how often have you shared this documentation with those listed below? (Please circle the number corresponding to your chosen response.)

	<u>Almost Never</u>	<u>Seldom</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Usually</u>	<u>Almost Always</u>	
41. Commanders (clients)	1	2	3	4	5	(1/63)
42. OE Key Managers	1	2	3	4	5	(1/64)
43. Other OESOs	1	2	3	4	5	(1/65)
44. MACOM	1	2	3	4	5	(1/66)
45. Other (please specify): _____	1	2	3	4	5	

NOTE: If you have any case studies that have been appropriately cleared through clients and that you are willing to forward, please send them to:

Evaluation Directorate
OECS
Fort Ord, California 93941

OE STEPS

What percent of your OE operations in the last six months do you consider to be

46. Successful? _____%

(1/67,69)

47. Unsuccessful? _____%

(1/69,70)

48. Not sure _____%

(1/71,72)

In the successful OE operations, please estimate the degree to which you have been able to accomplish each of the steps in the OE process. (Please circle the number corresponding to your chosen response.)

	<u>Almost Never</u>	<u>Seldom</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Usually</u>	<u>Almost Always</u>	
49. Assessment	1	2	3	4	5	(2/8)
50. Planning	1	2	3	4	5	(2/9)
51. Implementation	1	2	3	4	5	(2/10)
52. Evaluation	1	2	3	4	5	(2/11)

In the unsuccessful OE operations, please estimate the degree to which you have been able to accomplish each of the steps in the OE process. (Please circle the number corresponding to your chosen response.)

	<u>Almost Never</u>	<u>Seldom</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Usually</u>	<u>Almost Always</u>	
53. Assessment	1	2	3	4	5	(2/12)
54. Planning	1	2	3	4	5	(2/13)
55. Implementation	1	2	3	4	5	(2/14)
56. Evaluation	1	2	3	4	5	(2/15)

57. How often do you refer clients to other resources to address problems beyond your scope of expertise (e.g., Chaplain, EEO Officer)?

	<u>Almost Never</u>	<u>Seldom</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Usually</u>	<u>Almost Always</u>	
	1	2	3	4	5	(2/16)

CLIENT SYSTEM LEVELS OF OPERATION

During the last six months, at what organizational level were your clients located? (This may differ from the level of your actual operations or your physical location.)

58. 0% Company ✓

(2/17,19)

59. 2.5% Battalion ✓

(2/19,22)

60. 1% Brigade ✓

(2/21,22)

61. 6.5% Division

(2/23,24)

15 62. 15% Installation Command Staff (i.e., Chief of Staff, Directors)

(2/25,26)

14 63. 14% Installation Staff (below Directorate level)

(2/27,28)

64. 1% Corps

(2/29,30)

65. 9.5% MACOM Staff

(2/31,32)

66. Other (please specify):

2 _____

ISSUES

During the last six months, what types of issues have you dealt with in terms of completed and ongoing operations? Be as specific as possible -- e.g., "change of command transition," "excessively high rate of poor discipline," "ineffective management practices," "ineffective orientation program." Estimate the number of times each issue was assessed and dealt with as a principal client concern.

No. Times

Issue

67.	_____	_____
68.	_____	_____
69.	_____	_____
70.	_____	_____
71.	_____	_____
72.	_____	_____

TYPES OF IMPLEMENTATIONS

What kinds of implementation strategies do you use? In the past six months, how often have you employed each of the following? (It is understood that these categories overlap. Indicate all the strategies you have used even if one was included within another.)

No. of
Times Used

Strategy

- | | | |
|-------|---|------------|
| _____ | 73. Action Planning (Meeting/Workshop/Conference) | (2/33, 34) |
| _____ | 74. Communication (Meeting/Workshop/Conference) | (2/35, 36) |
| _____ | 75. Conflict Resolution (Meeting/Workshop/Conference) | (2/37, 38) |
| _____ | 76. Goal Clarification (Meeting/Workshop/Conference) | (2/39, 40) |
| _____ | 77. Job Design/Enrichment (Meeting/Workshop/Conference) | (2/41, 42) |
| _____ | 78. Intergroup Cooperation (Meeting/Workshop/Conference) | (2/43, 44) |
| _____ | 79. Leadership and Management Development Course (LMDC) | (2/45, 46) |
| _____ | 80. Management by Objectives Training | (2/47, 48) |
| _____ | 81. Management of Meetings (Meeting/Workshop/Conference) | (2/49, 50) |
| _____ | 82. Open Feedback | (2/51, 52) |
| _____ | 83. Performance Counseling Training | (2/53, 54) |
| _____ | 84. Problem Solving (Meeting/Workshop/Conference) | (2/55, 56) |
| _____ | 85. Role Clarification | (2/57, 58) |
| _____ | 86. Survey Feedback (Meeting/Workshop/Conference) | (2/59, 60) |
| _____ | 87. Team Building (Meeting/Workshop/Conference) | (2/61, 62) |
| _____ | 88. Time Management (Meeting/Workshop/Conference) | (2/63, 64) |
| _____ | 89. Transition Model (Workshop/Leadership Transition Meeting) | (2/65, 66) |
| | Other (please specify): | |
| _____ | 90. _____ | |
| _____ | 91. _____ | |

EVALUATION INDICATORS

What means have you used to evaluate the effect your OE operations have had? In the past six months, how often have you used any of the following indicators? In general, how effective do you think each indicator is? Please rate each indicator even if you have not used it. (If you are not familiar with the indicator, leave the item blank.)

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>Approx. No. Times Used in last 6 mos.</u>	<u>Effectiveness</u> 1 = Terrible 2 = Poor 3 = Only fair 4 = Good 5 = Excellent					
<u>General</u>							
92. "Gut Feeling"	_____ (2/67,68)	1	2	3	4	5	(2/69)
93. Interviews	_____ (2/70,71)	1	2	3	4	5	(2/72)
94. Reduction of Complaints	_____ (2/73,74)	1	2	3	4	5	(2/75)
95. Client Comments	_____ (2/76,77)	1	2	3	4	5	(2/78)
96. Appearance of Area	_____ (2/79,80)	1	2	3	4	5	(2/81)
97. Other (please specify): _____	_____	1	2	3	4	5	
<u>Questionnaires</u>							
98. WEQ (Work Environment Questionnaire)	_____ (3/11,12)	1	2	3	4	5	(3/13)
99. GOQ	_____ (3/14,15)	1	2	3	4	5	(3/16)
100. Self-Designed	_____ (3/17,18)	1	2	3	4	5	(3/19)
101. Other (please specify): _____	_____	1	2	3	4	5	

OFFICE
USE
ONLY

Effectiveness

1 = Terrible
2 = Poor
3 = Only fair
4 = Good
5 = Excellent

<u>Indicator</u>	<u>Approx. No. Times Used in last 6 mos.</u>						
<u>Records Data</u>							
102. Accident Rate	_____	(3/20,21)	1	2	3	4	5 (3/22)
103. Administration of Pay and Promotions	_____	(3/23,24)	1	2	3	4	5 (3/25)
104. ARTEP Scores	_____	(3/26,27)	1	2	3	4	5 (3/28)
105. Awards and Decorations	_____	(3/29,30)	1	2	3	4	5 (3/31)
106. AWOL Rate	_____	(3/32,33)	1	2	3	4	5 (3/34)
107. Barracks Larceny Rate	_____	(3/35,36)	1	2	3	4	5 (3/37)
108. Civilian Personnel Turnover	_____	(3/38,39)	1	2	3	4	5 (3/40)
109. Courts Martial	_____	(3/41,42)	1	2	3	4	5 (3/43)
110. Equipment Maintenance	_____	(3/44,45)	1	2	3	4	5 (3/46)
111. IG Complaints	_____	(3/47,48)	1	2	3	4	5 (3/49)
112. Major Inspections (IG)	_____	(3/50,51)	1	2	3	4	5 (3/52)
113. Materials Reduction	_____	(3/53,54)	1	2	3	4	5 (3/55)
114. Nonjudicial Punishment Rates	_____	(3/56,57)	1	2	3	4	5 (3/58)
115. Reenlistment Rate	_____	(3/59,60)	1	2	3	4	5 (3/61)
116. Sick Call Rate	_____	(3/62,63)	1	2	3	4	5 (3/64)
117. Time Reduction (for Task)	_____	(3/65,66)	1	2	3	4	5 (3/67)
118. Training Time	_____	(3/68,69)	1	2	3	4	5 (3/70)
119. Unit Readiness Reports	_____	(3/71,72)	1	2	3	4	5 (3/73)
120. Other (please specify): _____	_____		1	2	3	4	5

THE OESO COURSE

Please circle the number corresponding to your chosen response.

The course put the right emphasis on:	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Neither Agree nor Disagree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	
121. Systems theory	1	2	3	4	5	(4/8)
122. Individual processes	1	2	3	4	5	(4/9)
123. Group processes	1	2	3	4	5	(4/10)
124. Task orientation	1	2	3	4	5	(4/11)
125. Four-step process	1	2	3	4	5	(4/12)
126. Design and facilitation	1	2	3	4	5	(4/13)
127. Some of the course could have been taught by self- directed study.	1	2	3	4	5	(4/14)
128. The course needs more experiential emphasis.	1	2	3	4	5	(4/15)
129. The course needs more didactic emphasis.	1	2	3	4	5	(4/16)

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 4 = Agree
- 5 = Strongly Agree

Please use the scale above to rate the Blocks of Instruction shown in the matrix below. Write the number corresponding to your response in the blocks provided for items 130-156. Note that the item number is listed in each block of the matrix. Fill in the entire matrix.

Blocks of Instruction (BOI's)

	Indivi- dual Wk	LMDC	Inter- viewing	Design & Facil	Systems	GOQ	Con- sulting Skills	Work- Shops	FTX
AN APPROPRI- ATE AMOUNT OF TIME WAS SPENT ON ...	130 (4/17)	131 (4/18)	132 (4/19)	133 (4/20)	134 (4/21)	135 (4/22)	136 (4/23)	137 (4/24)	138 (4/25)
THE COURSE PLACED THE RIGHT EM- PHASIS ON ...	139 (4/26)	140 (4/27)	141 (4/28)	142 (4/29)	143 (4/30)	144 (4/31)	145 (4/32)	146 (4/33)	147 (4/34)
IF I HAD THE POWER I WOULD DELETE ...	148 (4/35)	149 (4/36)	150 (4/37)	151 (4/38)	152 (4/39)	153 (4/40)	154 (4/41)	155 (4/42)	156 (4/43)

Please use the scale below to respond to items 157-161. Write the number corresponding to your response in the block provided for each item.

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 4 = Agree
- 5 = Strongly Agree

APIE

	Scouting & Contracting	Assessment	Planning	Implementation	Evaluation
OECS ADEQUATELY PREPARED ME TO DO ...	157 (4/44)	158 (4/45)	159 (4/46)	160 (4/47)	161 (4/48)

Please use the scale below to respond to items 162-170. Write the number corresponding to your response in the block provided for each item.

- 1 = Almost Never
- 2 = Seldom
- 3 = Sometimes
- 4 = Usually
- 5 = Always

	Individual Wk	LMDC	Inter-viewing	Design & Facil	Systems	GOQ	Con-sulting Skills	Work-shops	Case Study
I USE THESE SKILLS AS AN OESO ...	162 (4/49)	163 (4/50)	164 (4/51)	165 (4/52)	166 (4/53)	167 (4/54)	168 (4/55)	169 (4/56)	170 (4/57)

171. If I could, I would add a block of instruction on:

Here we ask that you give us the benefit of any additional thoughts you may have concerning the preparation and training provided by the course. Has the course provided you the foundation in OE to enable you to do your job in your present assignment? (Use the back of the page if necessary).

USE
ONLY

FIELD SUPPORT LITERATURE

Of the OE literature that you have access to, use the scale on the right to rate each item. (Please circle the number corresponding to your chosen response.)

WORTHLESS
OF LITTLE VALUE
CAN'T JUDGE
USEFUL
VERY USEFUL

172. ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS (OE) ACTIVITIES & TRAINING (AR 600-76)	1	2	3	4	5	(3/8)
173. COMMANDERS GUIDE TO ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS (TG 26-1)	1	2	3	4	5	(3/9)
174. OESO HANDBOOK	1	2	3	4	5	(3/10)
175. OE COMMUNIQUE	1	2	3	4	5	(3/11)
176. FACTORS IN ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS (RB 26-1)	1	2	3	4	5	(3/12)
177. OE RESOURCE BOOK (RB 26-2)	1	2	3	4	5	(3/13)
178. SMALL GROUP METHODS OF INSTRUCTION (RB 26-3)	1	2	3	4	5	(3/14)
179. COMPONENTS OF ORGANIZATIONAL COMPETENCE: TEST OF A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK (RB 26-4)	1	2	3	4	5	(3/15)
180. GUIDE TO ASSESSMENT OF ORGANIZATIONAL PROCESS PERFORMANCE OF BATTLE STAFFS (RB 26-5)	1	2	3	4	5	(3/16)
181. TRAINERS GUIDE AND LESSON PLANS TO THE LEADERSHIP & MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT COURSE (ST 26-105-6)	1	2	3	4	5	(3/17)
182. STUDENT HANDBOOK: LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT COURSE (ST 26-105-6-1)	1	2	3	4	5	(3/18)
183. LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT TRAINERS COURSE HANDBOOK (ST 26-105-6-2)	1	2	3	4	5	(3/19)
184. THE MANAGEMENT OF STRESS (ST 26-150-1)	1	2	3	4	5	(3/20)
185. JOB PERFORMANCE COUNSELING (ST 26-150-2)	1	2	3	4	5	(3/21)

NOT USEFUL
 OF LITTLE VALUE
 CAN'T JUDGE
 USEFUL
 VERY USEFUL

ONLY

- | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|--------|
| 186. CHANGE OF COMMAND TRANSITION MODEL | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (3/22) |
| 187. MANAGING THE CONTEXT OF WORK | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (3/23) |
| 188. ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS (RB 12-2) (Reference book for USACGSC instruction on OE) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (3/24) |
| 189. LEADERSHIP AND EXCHANGE IN FORMAL ORGANIZATIONS (RB 22-100-1) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | (3/25) |
| 190. OTHER (specify) _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |

191. If I could, I would delete the following items from the above (list all item numbers that apply): _____

192. If I could, I would add the following OE support literature:

193. The Commanders Guide to OE would be most improved by: (Check one.) (3/26)

- ___(1) adding more information.
- ___(2) deleting unnecessary contents.
- ___(3) it is fine as it is.
- ___(4) other (please specify): _____

194. If I could, I would make the Commanders Guide to OE a field manual. (3/27)

- ___(1) Yes ___(2) No

OFFICE
USE
ONLY

INTERACTION WITH SENIOR OFFICERS

To what extent do the following aspects hinder or help you in dealing with Senior Officers (O6 and above) in OE-related matters? (Please circle the number corresponding to your chosen response.)

	<u>Greatly Hinders</u>	<u>Hinders</u>	<u>Neither Hinders nor Helps</u>	<u>Helps</u>	<u>Greatly Helps</u>	
195. Your current grade	1	2	3	4	5	(3/28)
196. Your current branch	1	2	3	4	5	(3/29)
197. Your previous command experience	1	2	3	4	5	(3/30)
198. Your previous staff experience	1	2	3	4	5	(3/31)
199. Other (please specify): _____	1	2	3	4	5	

For items 200-202, please circle the number corresponding to your chosen response.

	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Neither Agree nor Disagree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	
200. Interaction with LTCs (05) is difficult for me.	1	2	3	4	5	(3/32)
201. Interacting with colonels (06) is difficult for me.	1	2	3	4	5	(3/33)
202. Interacting with general officers is difficult for me.	1	2	3	4	5	(3/34)

ACCEPTANCE OF OE

(Please use the other side of the paper if needed.)

203. What things are getting in your way as an OESO?

204. What things increase your effectiveness as an OESO?

205. What expectations did you have as a result of your training at OECS (OETC) that were not met in your current OE practice?

206. All in all, acceptance of the OE process at my locations is:
(Please circle the number corresponding to your chosen response.)

Terrible Poor Only fair Good Excellent

1 2 3 4 5

207. If you answered 1, 2, or 3 to item 206, why do you feel acceptance is low?

OENCO COURSE

208. Do you currently have an OENCO course graduate assigned to your office?

(5/36)

___(1) Yes ___(2) No

If you answered "no" to 208, skip to 212 at the bottom of the page.

209. In your office, what specific tasks does this OENCO perform?

210. Please rate how well the OECS (OETC) OENCO Course has prepared your OENCO to perform his/her assigned duties. (Circle the number corresponding to your chosen response.)

(5/37)

<u>Poorly</u>	<u>Fairly Poorly</u>	<u>Marginally</u>	<u>Fairly Well</u>	<u>Very Well</u>
1	2	3	4	5

211. What changes would you suggest to improve his/her preparedness?

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

212. List the OE-related professional development that you have participated in during your current tour.

For items 213-216, please circle the number corresponding to your chosen response.

	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Neither Agree nor Disagree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	
213. All in all, I am satisfied with the training I received at OECS (OETC).	1	2	3	4	5	(3/38)
214. All in all, I am satisfied with the field support literature I receive.	1	2	3	4	5	(3/39)
215. All in all, I am satisfied with the direction that the OE program is taking in the Army.	1	2	3	4	5	(3/40)
216. All in all, I am satisfied with the support I get from OECS now that I am in the field.	1	2	3	4	5	(3/41)

YOUR REACTIONS TO THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

For items 217 and 218, please circle the number corresponding to your chosen response.

	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Neither Agree nor Disagree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	
217. The questionnaire items are easy to understand.	1	2	3	4	5	(3/42)
218. The questionnaire items are appropriate.	1	2	3	4	5	(3/43)
219. It took me approximately _____ minutes to complete this questionnaire.						(3/44, 45)
220. THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!! If there is anything else you feel we should know, please use the back of this page to tell us about it.						

APPENDIX B

Classification of "Issues"

This appendix contains an explanation of how responses to Items 67-72 were classified. The process employed is known as "content analysis." Responses to the items were inspected, and 10 general categories were selected which appeared to encompass the issues noted by the respondents. A miscellaneous category is also included. It is apparent that the categories chosen overlap to some degree, and certain classifications may seem arbitrary. "Lack of communication/coordination," for example, is sometimes difficult to distinguish from a "need for planning/problem-solving/decision-making." And these two categories cannot always be distinguished from "ineffective management practices."

In reporting the issues with which they had dealt during the preceding six months, OESOs frequently noted the operation they had employed rather than the actual issue or problem addressed. In these cases, an attempt was made to classify the response into whichever classification seemed most appropriate. "Management by Objectives," for example, was judged to fall into the "Planning" category, and "Stress Management" was classified as "Conflict." Table B-1 contains typical issues for each of the categories.

Table B-1

Classification of Issues Reported by OESOs

Short Title	Expanded Title	Typical Issues
Communication	Lack of communication/coordination	<p>Team building</p> <p>Interpersonal skill development/awareness</p> <p>Effective listening</p> <p>Poor performance counseling</p> <p>Lack of reward/recognition/reinforcement</p> <p>Lack of input to decision-making or planning</p> <p>Difference in perception of priorities for organization</p> <p>Lack of trust</p> <p>Lack of assertiveness</p> <p>Need for information-sharing</p>
Planning	Need for planning/problem-solving/decision-making	<p>Poor management of meeting/time</p> <p>Need for setting priorities/goals/objectives</p> <p>Need for clarification of roles/values/goals</p> <p>Need for review of policy</p> <p>Excessive overtime</p> <p>Personnel shortages (problem-solving)</p>
Transitions	Transitions of Command/Management	<p>Change in management or command</p>
Leadership and Management	Ineffective leadership/management practices/policies/procedures	<p>Ineffective leadership and management skills</p> <p>Need to improve staff effectiveness</p> <p>Lack of junior NCO experience</p> <p>Poor delegation habits</p> <p>Inappropriate leadership style</p> <p>Poor performance counseling</p> <p>Poor procedures for selection of civilian mid-level supervisors</p> <p>Chain of command problems</p>

Table B-1 (Cont.)

Classification of Issues Reported by OESOs

Short Title	Expanded Title	Typical Issues
Morale	Low morale/motivation/job satisfaction	Low reenlistment rates Personnel retention problems Low productivity Favoritism High AWOL rates Officer retention problems Need to increase involvement
Conflict	Need to resolve conflict	Poor intra-group relations Poor inter-group relations Personal conflicts Stress management
Reorganization	Need for reorganization/restructuring	Need for reorganization or restructuring
Assessment	Need for assessment/education/surveys	Need for survey assistance (e.g., QOL assessment) Need for evaluation (e.g., brigade evaluation, assessment of management practices)
Specific issues	Specific/general issues	Sexism Problems concerning women (including women in combat) Drug problems Racial difficulties Equal opportunity complaints General issues Poor unit conditions

Table B-1 (Cont.)
Classification of Issues Reported by OESOs

Short Title	Expanded Title	Typical Issues
Training	Ineffective training/orientation procedures	Poor training or orientation procedures or programs
Miscellaneous	Miscellaneous	OE in combat Maintenance problems Problems requiring consultation